

SLD Eligibility Manual Focus Group

January 23, 2008

Attendance:

- Carol Massanari
- Dave Forbush
- Michael Herbert
- Rob Richardson
- Melina Alexander
- Jake Zollinger
- Deb Spark
- Peggy Milligan
- Jennie Gibson
- Randy Schelble
- Wendy Carver
- Lisa Arbogast
- Tanya Toles
- Kelli Kercher
- Glenna Gallo
- Karen Kowalski
- Janet Gibbs
- Nan Gray
- Amy Peay

Discussion of last meeting's minutes

- Pay attention to the LD Identification Conversation section. We want to make sure that the guidance document addresses these items.
 - Identification procedures should ensure consistency to the maximum degree possible.
 - Assurances of fidelity must be included.
 - The LD identification process should be efficient, focused, and clear based on the existing tiered models.
 - Determination must be based on comprehensive evaluation data from multiple sources.
 - Implementation of procedures must be accompanied by ongoing professional development available to all.
 - Determine must be sensitive and responsive to potential legal issues and ramifications.
 - Decisions must be based on data specific to the child.

- Procedures should foster collaboration across/within education and parents.
- Evaluation data should provide information that can be used for instructional decisions/implementation appropriate to the individual child.
- Procedures must be doable within existing resources while simultaneously influencing systems change.
- Also pay attention to the Table of Contents section. It may be adjusted throughout the day.

Discussion of the two versions of documents: Table of Contents version and the USOE version

- USOE document read more smoothly. It had a logical flow.
- There is no “meat” in either document.
 - The introduction and background is not an important part of the document.
 - Get into the “meat” of the document sooner.
- What are the parameters for discrepancy, RTI, or combo?
- Needs more examples so that the reader will know what to do.
- The FAQ would be better at the end of the document, rather than at the beginning. The questions were good questions.
- Include tabs in the document to allow the reader more easily access the document.
- The RTI procedure was not very clear.
 - Other states tend to not look at slow rates of progress. This is an important aspect to look at.
 - Look at standard error of the slope, how many data points do you need over a period of time, etc.
 - Need to have both level of discrepancy and growth rates.
 - Decide how to determine under-achievement.
- Reference Utah’s 3-Tiered Model.
- It is difficult to read the document, and then be referenced to a different part of the document. Have all relevant information in the same place.
- Not all bulleted points that were brought up in the last meeting were addressed in the document. Specifically – fidelity and legal issues.
- Use direct quotes when citing federal or state rules.
- Use graphic representations such as flow charts

The Purpose of Guidelines

- Guidelines are not prescriptive. They are strong guidance.
 - Guidelines do not carry the same weight as rules.
 - Guidelines do carry more weight than TA manuals.
 - Guidelines are a set of decision rules that are broad enough to guide thinking, but do not require checklists.
- If we do not put requirements, there will be false positives. How do we ensure that appropriate instruction has taken place?
- How will UPIPS monitoring relate to this document? Monitoring is based off of rules, not guidelines.
- **The purpose of the guidelines is to help LEAs develop their own procedures for LD eligibility determination.**
- Need to make sure that the State has policies set in place – not just LEAs, since this is mentioned in the federal rules.
- Procedures need to be somewhat consistent state-wide.

The Process

- **Foundation – General Education** (Dave Forbush, Michael Herbert, Rob Richardson, Melina Alexander)
 - Must have in place curriculum
 - Documentation of access to effective instruction
 - Movement and decisions between tiers
 - Problem-solving process
 - Parent Involvement
- **Referral Process** (Jake Zollinger, Deb Spark, Peggy Milligan, Jennie Gibson)
 - Considerations – making the decision that a referral is needed
 - Referral requirements
 - Parent Involvement
- **Comprehensive Evaluation** (Randy Schelble, Wendy Carver, Lisa Arbogast, Tanya Toles, Kelli Kercher)
 - What does it look like and include
 - Documentation
- **Determination of Eligibility** (Glenna Gallo, Karen Kowalski, Janet Gibbs)
 - Documentation requirements

Reactions on Group Work (See attached documents)

Foundation

- Scientifically research based or evidence-based?
 - Evidence-based can be limiting – especially concerning curriculum
 - Probably use scientifically research based
- Should scientifically research based intervention be include in Tiers 2 and 3?

- Fidelity check – implementation of interventions
- Include questions looking back on student's response to instruction before moving to the next tier. Try to fix instruction before moving on to the next tier.

Referral

- Under "other considerations" include the question if the level of intervention is so intense that even though there is progress.... (I wasn't able to catch the end of the question. DO you remember what it was?)

Comprehensive Evaluation

- Where would strategies go?
- Tailor the assessment to each child.
- Under "other things to consider" put other question that the team can consider.
- Where are we looking for strengths?
- There need to be prompts to look for strengths – include in the entire process.

Determination of Eligibility

- The rules say that all team members must be qualified. Who decides if team members are qualified?
- Does "repeated assessment" mean only two assessments? Two assessments don't show trend lines. Would need at least three assessments.

Next Steps

- Janet, Peggy, Randy and Michael will form the writing committee and create a draft in February.
- Present the draft to LEA Special Education Directors in March
- Go over the draft at our next meeting **April 9 9:00 – 3:30**